



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,805	02/24/2004	Yoshinobu Imoto	040894-7000	1179
9629 7590 08/09/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER ADEGEYE, OLUWASEUN	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,805

Applicant(s)

IMOTO, YOSHINOBU

Examiner

Oluwaseun A. Adegeye

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/24/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07/19/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/22/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references listed on the information disclosure statement filed on 02/22/2006 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO – 1449).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Um et al (US 2003/0118327 A1) in view of Ito et al (US 6,937,356 B1) and Kubota et al (US 5,469,272).

As to claim 10, Um discloses an optical disk reproducing apparatus comprising:
a reading unit (fig. 2, 38) that reads image data recorded on an optical disk (see [38], [39] and fig. 2);

a first decoding unit (fig. 2, 34, 35) that decodes moving image data (see [38]);
a second decoding unit (fig. 2, 32, 33) that decodes still image file including still image data (see [39]);

Art Unit: 2621

a switching unit (fig. 2, 19, 37) that receives the image data from the reading unit, outputs the image data to the first decoding unit when the image data is the moving data, and outputs the image data to the second decoding unit when the image data is the still image data (see [38], [39] and fig. 2);

a video signal output unit (fig. 2, 30, 31) that is connected to the first decoding unit and the second decoding unit and outputs a reproduction video signal of the image data decoded by the first decoding unit or by the second decoding unit (see [38] and [39]);

Um also discloses a controller (19) but does not disclose

a header analysis unit that is disposed between the switching unit and the second decoding unit and analyzes a header of the still image file;

a control unit that determines whether or not an extension of the still image file is a predetermined extension; wherein when the control unit determines that extension of the still image file is the predetermined extension, the header analysis unit analyzes the header of the still image file and determines whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is decodable; and

reading of the still image file by the reading unit is stopped when the header analysis unit determines that the still image file is a still image file that is not decodable.

Ito discloses a header analysis unit (fig. 15, 621) that analyzes a header of the still image file (see column 16, lines 15 – 18, column 17, lines 3 – 7 and column 17, lines 46 – 51).

Art Unit: 2621

Ito also discloses a control unit that determines whether or not an extension of the still image file is a predetermined extension (see column 17, lines 19 – 25); wherein when the control unit determines that extension of the still image file is the predetermined extension, the header analysis unit analyzes the header of the still image file (see column 17, lines 33 – 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the header analysis unit and the control unit taught by Ito to the apparatus of Um so that pictures can be taken or processed even during a print, display, transmission or viewing of the pictures (see column 5, lines 43 – 50).

Um in view of Ito do not disclose a header analysis unit that determines whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is decodable.

Kubota discloses a header analysis unit that determines whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is decodable (column 2, lines 36 – 37 discloses a header with ID. Column 21, line 52 – column 22, line 3 discloses determining whether a still image file is decodable or not).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the determining step of Kubota to the apparatus of Um in view of Ito so that a function subject to interchangeability may be distinguished from those not subject to interchangeability, so that it would be easy for the producer to add unique functions in future for distinction from other functions.

As to claim 2, Um discloses an optical disk reproducing apparatus comprising:
a body (see [22]);

reading means (fig. 2, 38) for reading image data recorded on an optical disk set in the body (see [38] and [39]);

decoding means (fig. 2, 32, 33, 34, 35) for decoding the image data read by the reading means (see [38] and [39]);

video signal output means (fig. 2, 30, 31) for outputting a reproduction video signal of the image data decoded by the decoding means (see [38] and [39]);

Um does not disclose determination means in which when an extension of a still image file instructed to be reproduced is a predetermined extension, a header of the still image file is analyzed and it is determined whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is decodable in the body; and

reading stop means for stopping reading of the still image file by the reading means when the determination means determines that the still image file is a still image file that is not decodable in the body.

It also discloses determination means that determines whether or not an extension of the still image file is a predetermined extension (see column 17, lines 19 – 25); wherein when the control unit determines that extension of the still image file is the predetermined extension, the header analysis unit analyzes the header of the still image file (see column 17, lines 33 – 51).

Kubota discloses a header analysis unit that determines whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is decodable (column 2, lines 36 – 37 discloses a header with ID. Column 21, line 52 – column 22, line 3 discloses determining whether a still image file is decodable or not).

Art Unit: 2621

Kubota also discloses reading stop means for stopping reading of the still image file by the reading means when the determination means determines that the still image file is a still image file that is not decodable in the body (see column 21, line 52 – column 22, line 3).

As to claim 1, this claim differs from claim 2 only in that the limitation “wherein the video signal output means outputs a predetermined video signal when the determination means determines that the still image file is the still image file that is not decodable in the body” is additionally recited.

Kubota discloses wherein the video signal output means outputs a predetermined video signal when the determination means determines that the still image file is the still image file that is not decodable in the body (see column 21, lines 37 – 46).

As to claim 6, grounds for rejecting claim 2 apply to claim 6 in its entirety.

As to claim 3, Um in view of Ito and Kubota disclose the optical disk reproducing apparatus as claimed in claim 2.

Kubota discloses the video signal output means outputs a predetermined video signal when the determination means determines that the still image file is the still image file that is not decodable in the body (see column 21, lines 37 – 46).

As to claim 4, Ito discloses the optical disk reproducing apparatus as claimed in claim 2, wherein the predetermined extension is JPG (see column 17, lines 3 – 7 and column 21, lines 38 – 42).

As to claim 5, Um discloses the optical disk reproducing apparatus as claimed in claim 2, wherein the decoding means has a function of decoding moving image data compressed in MPEG2 (see [47]).

As to claim 7, grounds for rejecting claim 3 apply to claim 7 in its entirety.

As to claim 8, grounds for rejecting claim 4 apply to claim 8 in its entirety.

As to claim 9, grounds for rejecting claim 5 apply to claim 9 in its entirety.

As to claim 11, grounds for rejecting claim 3 apply to claim 11 in its entirety.

As to claim 12, grounds for rejecting claim 4 apply to claim 12 in its entirety.

As to claim 13, grounds for rejecting claim 5 apply to claim 13 in its entirety.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 2002/0126987 A1 discloses a still picture player.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oluwaseun A. Adegeye whose telephone number is 571-270-1711. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

07/26/2007

O.A

Mehrdad Dastouri
MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600
for Thai Tran